



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS
IN
AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY

Vol. 12, No. 7, pp. 249-282

February 10, 1917

BANDELIER'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY
OF ANCIENT MEXICAN SOCIAL
ORGANIZATION

BY

T. T. WATERMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY

TRADITION OVERTURNED IN WATERMAN'S REPORT

He Supports Democratic Theory of Aztec Life in Paper on Mexican Organization

Montezuma was not a "king" but only a war-chieftain. The famous Aztec "empire" was not an empire at all, but only a loose confederacy of democratic Indian tribes. Montezuma's "palace" was not a palace, but only war headquarters for the tribe.

Such are the overturnings of tradition which the American ethnologists of today are demanding. T. T. Waterman, assistant professor of anthropology in the University, has come to the support of this democratic interpretation of Aztec life in a paper on "Bandelier's Contribution to the Study of Ancient Mexican Social Organization" just issued in the University publications in American archaeology and ethnology.

Montezuma Was Elected Chief

Montezuma, says Professor Paterman, was only an elected war-chief. He had no power to declare war, this having been the prerogative of the tribal council. The choice of a war-chief was, however, limited to one group, which consisted of a whole family or lineage, but son did not follow father unless duly elected. The sons of the war-chiefs were brought up as private citizens.

The head war-chief, such as Montezuma, was of no higher rank than the coadjutor who held the extraordinary title of "Snake-Woman." The functions of the man who held this office are not clearly known, but apparently an important part of his office was the gathering and housing of tribute.

Misunderstanding of Aztec life has arisen from the fact that the Spanish conquerors did not realize the fundamental differences between Indian and Spanish society. Land was owned, not by individuals, but by the clan. To the Aztec the clan was the essential thing. Aztec society was essentially democratic, while Spanish society was essentially feudal.

CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS OF ANTHROPOLOGY

with archaeological and ethnological subjects issued of Anthropology are sent in exchange for the publications of museums, and for journals devoted to general ethnology. They are for sale at the prices stated. Exchange Department, University Library, Berkeley, California. Remittances should be addressed to the University of California.

American Archaeology and Ethnology, Classical Philology, and Semitic Philology, Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig, Pathology, Physiology, Zoology and also American Archaeology and Ethnology, Berlin.

ETHNOLOGY.—A. L. Kroeber, Editor. Prices, Volume 11, inclusive, \$3.50 each; Volume 12 and following

Calif. Publ. Am. Arch. Ethn.	Price
the Hupa, by Pliny Earle Goddard. Pp. 1-88; December, 1903	\$1.25
Earle Goddard. Pp. 89-368. March, 1904	3.00
the Potter Creek Cave, by William J. Sinclair. 4. April, 1904	.40
Coast of California South of San Francisco, by 29-80, with a map. June, 1904	.60
the in California, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 81-103.	.25
Indians of Northwestern California, by A. L. 64; plates 15-21. January, 1905	.75
of South Central California, by A. L. Kroeber. 1907	2.25
the Hupa Language, by Pliny Earle Goddard.	3.50
Relations between Mexico and Japan, from preserved in Spain and Japan, by Zelia Nuttall. 1906	.50
Physical Anthropology of California, based on collection of Anthropology of the University of the U. S. National Museum, by Ales Hrdlicka. 1906; plates 1-10, and map. June, 1906	.75
the of California, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 65-166.	1.50
South Central California, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 7	.76
of East Central California and Nevada, by A. L. 1907. September, 1907	.75
Indians of California, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 319-1907	.50
74.	
Hupa Language; Part I, The Individual Sounds, Goddard. Pp. 1-20, plates 1-8. March, 1907	.35
rs and Songs, with Texts and Translations, by pws, edited by Pliny Earle Goddard. Pp. 21-63.	.75
Earle Goddard. Pp. 65-238, plate 9. December,	2.50
of the Klamath Lake and Modoc Indians of 1907. June, 1910	.75
and Language, by Roland B. Dixon. Pp. 293-	1.00
384.	
of the Pomo and Neighboring Indians, by Sam- Pp. 1-332, maps 1-2. February, 1908	3.25
jects of the Miwok Indians, by Samuel Alfred 1908, map 3.	
Occupation of Certain Regions by the Miwok Kroeber. Pp. 369-380. Nos. 2 and 3 in one cover.	.50
00.	

447-6
Univ Press. Gift.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS
IN
AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY

Vol. 12, No. 7, pp. 249-282

February 10, 1917

BANDELIER'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY
OF ANCIENT MEXICAN SOCIAL
ORGANIZATION

BY
T. T. WATERMAN

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	249
Clan organization in ancient Mexico	252
Governmental functions of the clan	256
Honorary chiefs	256
The clan council	257
Executive officers of the clan	258
The war-leader, or <i>achcacahtin</i>	259
The civil officials	260
The tribe and tribal government	261
The tribe and the phratry	261
The tribal council	262
The head war-chief	264
Duality of the office	267
The "Snake-Woman"	267
The "Four Quarters," or phratries	269
The "Captains-general," or phratry-captains	270
Other institutions in the phratry	271
Points of difficulty	272
Conclusion	273
Alphabetical list of sources cited by Bandelier	276

INTRODUCTION

There are two widely different schools of doctrine concerning the political and social institutions which the Spaniards encountered among the highly civilized natives of the Mexican plateau. One school consists of two investigators, Lewis H. Morgan¹ and A. F. Bandelier.²

¹ Ancient Society, New York, 1877; League of the Iroquois, New York, 1904; "Montezuma's Dinner," in North American Review, April, 1876.

² "On the Art of War and Mode of Warfare of the Ancient Mexicans," Reports of the Peabody Museum. Harvard University, II, 95-161; "On the Dis-

These two writers consider that the famous Aztec "empire" was not an empire at all, but a loose confederacy of democratic Indian tribes. They have been supported in more recent literature by John Fiske, in his *Discovery of America*,³ and by the sentiments, if not in the published writings, of most American ethnologists. The opposing school consists, broadly speaking, of the other scholars who have written on the subject.^{3a} In most of the literature which concerns the Aztecs the assumption is made throughout that they had monarchical institutions. The "supreme rulers" of the Aztec "empire" are represented in some very recent works as independent monarchs, keeping the state and pomp of moguls. Bandelier's papers mentioned above are by far the most serious contributions to the subject. He makes an effort to reconstruct a picture of the entire Aztec social order. It is the purpose of the present paper to review and criticize his results. It seems simplest to consider his findings with reference to one tribe, namely, the Mexicans, or inhabitants of Tenochtitlan. His own references to the original sources are given in the following pages in the form of footnotes. No new material is involved.

A word might be said in the beginning about Bandelier's method of composing his papers. We conclude, from remarks in his "Sources for the Aboriginal History of Spanish America,"⁴ that it was his habit first to write a paper out of his fund of general information on a subject, citing authorities only on special points, and when the idea suddenly occurred to him. Then he went through the paper again and worked up a most formidable set of footnotes, in which he often embodied the results of further research. In the case of the contributions at present referred to, he wrote three papers on practically the same subject, each paper more elaborate than the one before. The result of all three is a sort of complex, full of statements anticipatory of other statements, and statements presupposing a knowledge which the reader lacks, a complex in which the first portion is unintelligible without the last, while the last presupposes a knowledge of the first.

Worse than all, in connection with some essential points, the author allows himself to become involved in contradictions. Moreover, he nowhere gives a list of sources. He permits himself to employ such

tribution and Tenure of Land and Customs with Respect to Inheritance of the Ancient Mexicans," *ibid.*, pp. 385-448; "On the Social Organization and Mode of Government of the Ancient Mexicans," *ibid.*, pp. 557-669. These papers are cited as *Art of War*, *Tenure of Land*, and *Mode of Government*, respectively.

³ Cambridge, Mass., 1892.

^{3a} An honorable exception is Beuchat, *Manuel d'archéologie américaine*, Paris, 1912.

⁴ Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, XXVII, 1878.

TABLE SHOWING BANDELIER'S SOURCES

The dates indicate in each case the period when composition was begun. While the dates are in many cases conjectural, the general order is approximately correct. The sources which seem most important from the standpoint of ethnography are indicated by bold-face type.

Date	Author	Title
1505	✓Martyr, Peter (Pietro Martire d'Anghiera)	De novo orbe
1519	✓Cortés, Hernando	Cartas
1521	Zuazo, Alonso de	Carta
1524	Alvarado, Pedro de	Relación a Hernán Cortés
1525	Oviedo y Valdez, Gonzalo Fernández de	Historia general y natural , etc.
	✓Anonymous Conqueror, The	Relación de algunas cosas, etc.
1527	Las Casas, Bartolomé de	Historia de las Indias
1530	Merced a Hernán Cortés de tierras inmediatas de México, etc. Cuarta relación anónima de la jornada . . . a Nueva Galicia, etc.	
1531	Lettre des auditeurs Salmeron, Maldonado, Ceynos et Queroga Salmeron (given names not ascertained)	Lettre . . . au conseil des Indes
1534	Bologna, Francisco de	Lettre, etc.
1540	Concilios provinciales . . . de México Tapia, Andrés de	Relación , etc.
1541	Acazitli, Francisco de Sandoval Motolinia (Toribio de Benevente)	Relación de jornada, etc. Historia de los Indios
1546	Sahagún, Bernardino de	Historia general
1550	Codex Mendoza Codex Ramírez Codex Telleriano-Remensis Des cérémonies observés . . . lorsqu'ils faisaient un tecle De l'ordre de succession observé par les Indiens Molina, Alonso de Mendoza, Antonio de Gómara, Francisco López de	Vocabulario Avis de Vice-Roi, etc. Historia general
1551	Relación de las ceremonias y ritos, etc.	
1552	✓ Díaz del Castillo, Bernal	Historia verdadera
1554	Anunciación, Domingo de la Lettre des chapelains Frère Toribio et Frère Diego d'Olarste Montufar, Alonso de	Lettre, etc.
1560	✓ Zúrita, Alonso de	Supplique à Charles V Breve . . . relación (Rapport)
1569	Chavez, Gabriel de	Rapport sur . . . Meztitlan
1573	Mendieta, Gerónimo de	Historia eclesiástica
1576	Camargo, Domingo Muñoz Palacio, Diego Garéfa	Historia . . . de Taxeallan San Salvador und Honduras, etc.
1579	Durán, Diego	Historia de las Indias
1582	Pomar, Juan Bautista	Relación de Texcoco
1588	Acosta, José de Salamán	Historia natural y moral
1589	Torquemada, Juan de	. . . monarchia indiana
1596	Herrera, Antonio de	Historia . . . de los hechos, etc.
1598	Tezozomoc, Fernando de Alvarado García, Gregorio	Crónica mexicana Origen de los Indios
1608	Ixtlilxochitl, Fernando de Alva	Historia Chichimeca
1609	Solórzano y Pereyra, Juan	. . . de Indiarum jure
1610	Eslava, Fernán González de	Coloquios espirituales
1613	Remesal, Antonio de	Historia . . . de Chyapa
1617	Real ejecutoria de S. M. sobre tierras de Axapusco	
1635	Nieremberg, Joan Eusebius	Historia naturae
1697	Vetancurt, Agustín	Teatro mexicano
1742	Padilla, Matías de la Mota.	Historia de Nueva-Galicia
1765	Clavigero, Francisco Severio	Storia antica del Messico

baffling expressions as "the learned friar," or "the celebrated Franciscan,"⁵ in reference to a literature where the majority of the important writers are both friars and Franciscans. Still another feature of his work is this, that when he is in search of corroboration he appeals impartially to authors of the sixteenth, and of all subsequent centuries up to the end of the nineteenth, without outward preference or distinction. In any attempt to examine his findings at all closely, it is therefore necessary to have at hand a list of his authorities.⁶ These authorities appear in chronological order in the appended tabulation. For fuller information the reader is referred to the alphabetical list at the end of the present paper, and to the usual works of reference.⁷

CLAN ORGANIZATION IN ANCIENT MEXICO

In attempting to review the results of Bandelier's investigations of Mexican social organization, it seems best to begin with that element of society which the Indians would have considered the fundamental one. Mexico City was more than a city in our sense of the word. It was rather on the order of a city-state. The Mexicans are continually spoken of as a "tribe." We may regard it as absolutely certain that this tribe, numbering a great many thousands of individuals, was really a conglomerate of smaller units. In fact, continual reference is made in the sources to smaller social groups which seem, in many ways, to be of really fundamental importance. Nearly all authors, for example,⁸ represent the Aztec tribe at the beginning of its legendary history as starting off on its migration organized in kinship groups. These kins are worthy of careful attention.

⁵ Mode of Government, p. 687, note 276, for example.

⁶ He has two papers which in part supply this need, but only in part. One is the paper on "Sources for the Aboriginal History of Spanish America," mentioned above in note 4. The other is "Notes on the Bibliography of Yucatan and Central America," Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, n. s., I, 82-118.

⁷ For example: Sabin, Dictionary of Works Relating to America from the Discovery to the Present Time, New York, 1868-1891.

Winsor, Narrative and Critical History of America, especially the first two volumes, Boston, 8 volumes, no date.

Ticknor, History of Spanish Literature, Boston, 3 volumes, 1854, especially the fourth edition, Boston, 3 volumes, no date.

Bancroft, Works, 39 volumes, San Francisco, 1883-1890.

Lehmann, Progress in Mexican Research, Archiv für Anthropologie, VI, 1907; reprinted by the Duc de Loubat, Paris, 1909.

Icazbalceta, Bibliografía Mexicana del Siglo XVI, Mexico, 1866.

Weber, Beiträge zur Charakteristik der älteren Geschichtsschreiber über Spanish-Amerika, in Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte, edited by Lamprecht, XIV, Leipzig, 1911.

⁸ Acosta, Clavigero, Durán, García, Herrera, Ixtlilxochitl, Mendieta, Sahagún, Torquemada, Vetancurt.

There is considerable variation in the terms employed by the Spaniards to describe these units. The commonest is the word *barrio*, which seems to mean in the Spanish of the period a city ward or precinct. These barrios are in some passages called parishes, quarters, or *parcialidades*. The native equivalent is given by Zúrita⁹ as *calpulli*. The question is, just exactly what is meant, in modern terminology, by *calpulli*, and what was its function? Zúrita helps us out by telling us that "a *calpulli* is what the Jews called a tribe."¹⁰ Reference to the early books of the Bible will indicate that the Jewish tribe was believed to be a group descended from one ancestor. Torquemada also describes what are apparently these same groups, and says that they are based on the central idea of descent.¹¹ First of all, then, the *calpulli* was an organization of kin, probably what modern ethnographers would speak of as a "clan." Zúrita in another place adds: "The word *calpulli* . . . signifies a barrio inhabited by a family, known as of very ancient origin, which for a long time owns a territory of well-defined boundaries, and all the members of which are of the same lineage."¹² Here, then, is an additional trait of the *calpulli*—it is a land-holding organization. "The lands do not belong to each inhabitant of the village," says Zúrita, "but to the *calpulli*, which possesses them in common."¹³ "Very few people," according to Fuenleal, "have lands of their own. The lands are held in common."¹⁴ This fact is rendered certain enough to be accepted as probably characteristic of Mexican society, by corroboration by a number of authors.¹⁵ Gómara especially says that "many married people often live in one house, and brothers and sisters do not divide their lands." Peter Martyr also mentions the existence of communal houses.¹⁶ Each group of kin develops garden plots,¹⁷ which are called collectively "soil of the *calpulli*."¹⁸ Such lands could in no manner be sold, according to

⁹ Zúrita, p. 50. For exact reference see the list of sources at the end of the present paper.

¹⁰ Zúrita, p. 53.

¹¹ Torquemada, p. 545.

¹² Zúrita, p. 50.

¹³ Zúrita, p. 51.

¹⁴ Fuenleal, p. 253.

¹⁵ Clavigero, Book 7, ch. 14; Durán, ch. 5; Gómara, p. 443; Herrera, pp. 135, 190; Martyr, p. 228; Oviedo, Book 32, ch. 51, pp. 536, 537; Torquemada, p. 545, Book 2, ch. 11, Book 3, chs. 13, 22.

¹⁶ Peter Martyr, decade 5, ch. 10.

¹⁷ Acosta, Book 7, ch. 9, p. 473; Clavigero, Book 2, ch. 17; Tezozomoc, ch. 3, p. 8; Torquemada, Book 3, ch. 33, p. 291, Book 2, ch. 15, p. 101.

¹⁸ Ixtlilxochitl, ch. 35, p. 242; Zúrita, p. 51.

the passage in Clavigero,¹⁹ to which reference was made above (note 15). This statement on the part of Clavigero is corroborated by other authors.²⁰ No one but a member of a *calpulli* had the right to settle on any of its lands.²¹ These passages bring out rather clearly, with regard to the *calpulli*, that there was involved, in addition to the idea of common descent, a second idea that we often find associated with the clan-organization of other and ruder tribes, namely, common ownership of land. The *calpulli* appears in this connection quite clearly as analogous to the clan, as found, for example, among the Iroquois.

The fact that the *calpullis* were really fundamental is brought out by statements such as this: "Each *calpulli* was sovereign within its own limits."²² "Each quarter had its own soil without any connection with the other." This means that Mexican society was really founded on the *calpulli*, and that the tribe was an organization made up of a number of these fundamental units.

Some discrepancies exist in the references to ownership of lands. References are made in certain places to "public" or communal lands, and elsewhere to private holdings. The facts probably are that each *calpulli*, as a group, controlled certain lands, but these lands were assigned or allotted to small families for cultivation.²³ These lands could not be sold by the individual, or alienated in any way. This custom has an analogy in the agricultural institutions of the Iroquois, as described by Morgan.²⁴ The evidence for this arrangement among the Mexicans is found in Zúrita, and confirmed by other authors.²⁵ The soil was certainly occupied by individual families,²⁶ their lots or holdings being known as *tlatmilli*.²⁷ The right of occupancy was connected with inheritance.²⁸ We have it on the authority of one author²⁹ that if a man neglected for two years to cultivate his patch it was

¹⁹ Clavigero, Book 7, ch. 14.

²⁰ Herrera, decade 3, Book 4, ch. 15, p. 135; Torquemada, Book 14, ch. 7, p. 545; Zúrita, p. 52.

²¹ Zúrita, p. 53.

²² Clavigero, Book 7, ch. 14; Zúrita, pp. 51, 65.

²³ Zúrita, pp. 52, 56, 57, 60; De l'ordre de succession, pp. 223, 224.

²⁴ "Houses and House-Life of the American Aborigines," U. S. Department of the Interior, Contributions to North American Ethnology, iv, 79; for North American tribes in general see Ancient Society by the same author, pp. 154-174.

²⁵ Zúrita, p. 55; Clavigero, Book 7, ch. 14; Herrera, p. 135; Torquemada, p. 545.

²⁶ Zúrita, pp. 52, 56, 57, 60; De l'ordre de succession, pp. 223, 224.

²⁷ Molina.

²⁸ Clavigero, Book 7, ch. 14; De l'ordre de succession, p. 224; Fuenleal, p. 253; Herrera, p. 138; Torquemada, p. 545.

²⁹ Zúrita, p. 56.

assigned or allotted to someone else. When a family disappeared, the land reverted to the group.³⁰ It seems most reasonable to suppose, then, that the *calpullis*, as groups, held tenure of the land, as did the Iroquois clans; and the individuals merely occupied portions of the soil without having proprietary rights. There were certain plots, the produce of which went with certain offices, but the evidence concerning these "official" lands is very uncertain, and they may probably be passed over for the present without materially affecting the picture of Mexican land tenure. The *calpulli*, whatever it may have been, certainly exhibits in this respect a very fundamental resemblance to what are known as clans in the ethnographical literature of today.

The *calpulli* was involved in other activities than the ownership of land. Mexican "armies" are represented as consisting of bands of from two hundred to four hundred men. It is plausible to suppose that each band represented the fighting force of one *calpulli*. Each group, according to Durán, carried the emblem of their barrio. Here we see another likeness to the clan—the fact that the group made common cause in warfare.

There are two additional features of the *calpulli* which make the resemblance to the typical clan more striking still. Each one had its own god, or *calpultéotzin*,³¹ and its own central place of worship.³² I think therefore that we are on firm ground in assuming with Baudelier that Mexican society, at the time of the Conquest, was still organized on a primitive clan basis.

We come now to the question of the number of these *calpullis*. Twenty "chiefs" of the Mexicans are mentioned in some of the sources.³³ This would suggest the existence of twenty separate units in the tribe. Herrera, speaking of the "parishes" (*calpullis*), says that there were "many."³⁴ Torquemada³⁵ says that there were four general divisions, each with three or four *calpullis*, which would make a total of perhaps sixteen. Bernal Diaz again says that the central governing body was a "senate" of twenty.³⁶ On *a priori* grounds it seems likely that each clan would have a representative in such a senate. That would indicate that the precise number was probably

³⁰ Zúrita, p. 52.

³¹ Durán, p. 42.

³² Herrera, p. 188.

³³ Durán, pp. 97, 98, 99. Tezozomoc also might be cited.

³⁴ Herrera, p. 188.

³⁵ Torquemada, p. 545.

³⁶ Diaz, p. 95.

twenty. The number is given as twenty by Vetaneurt.³⁷ If the foregoing passages really describe the facts, the fundamental point of Mexican organization is that the nation or tribe consisted of an agglomerate of twenty independent clans. However elaborate their government may have been, it was based directly on a clan organization. Evidence for this idea, as may be seen by consulting the table of authors, is found in sources of the best character.

In connection with certain governmental and deliberative functions, each of the *calpullis* or clans just described had a council house, or *tecpan*. Sometimes these were themselves called merely *calpulli*. They contained halls and a tower.³⁸

Governmental Functions of the Clan

It remains now to discuss the officials, through whom the government was administered. It seems best, first of all, to clear the ground as far as we can of certain difficulties. One of the most troublesome of these is the occurrence of contradictory allusions to individuals, usually referred to as "chiefs," in Aztec *tecuhitli*.

Honorary Chiefs

Consult: *Art of War*, pp. 117-120; *Mode of Government*, pp. 641-644.

The orthography of this word *tecuhitli* shows considerable variety. The proper form seems to be the one given. The word *tecle*, used by Mendieta,³⁹ is apparently a variant of the same. It also occurs as *tec*, *tecutzin*, and *teutley*.⁴⁰ The stem means in Aztec simply "grandfather."

The various senses in which this term is used by the Spanish chroniclers leave us in some uncertainty as to the functions of the *tecuhitli*. According to Bandelier, it seems simplest to suppose that the *tecuhitli* was, after all, not a governmental official. He insists (though his own allusions to the dignity in question are inconsistent) that the *tecuhitlis* were members, we might say, of an order of merit, which was awarded especially for valor. It did not necessarily entitle the holder to office, or to authority of any sort. We must note, however, that the chamber where the principal governing body met was called the "place of *tecuhitlis*," according to Bandelier's etymology.⁴¹ While the situation with regard to the *tecuhitli* is by no means

³⁷ Cited in vague terms by Bandelier, *Mode of Government*, p. 592.

³⁸ Durán, p. 215; Herrera, p. 190; Tezozomoc, p. 58; Zúrita, p. 62.

³⁹ Mendieta, Book 2, chs. 38, 39.

⁴⁰ Zúrita, p. 47.

⁴¹ *Mode of Government*, p. 406, note 46.

clear, a dozen passages may be cited which give Bandelier's conclusion some authority.⁴² Offices were filled mostly by these "chiefs," or *tecuhltli*,⁴³ perhaps as offices in this country after the Civil War were filled largely by veterans. In Indian society especially successful warriors would of course be the most likely aspirants for official positions. The position or dignity was held for life, but it was not hereditary.⁴⁴ It involved, among other things, great outlay for feasts on the part of the candidate.⁴⁵ This certainly fits in with what we know of primitive society elsewhere in America—for example, on the Northwest coast, where rank and influence are connected with outlay for entertainment.⁴⁶ It seems probable, on the whole, that in discussing the governmental offices of the Aztecs, these "civil chiefs," or *tecuhltli*, are to be ruled out. A man with the title of *tecuhltli* might fill almost any office; and consequently the accounts of the privileges and duties which various members of this order had, involve us in all sorts of difficulties. It seems quite likely that the rank of *tecuhltli* was an honor, not an office. In my opinion, Bandelier does not establish this fact clearly, but at least it is a plausible theory.

The Clan Council

Consult: *Tenure of Land*, p. 425 and notes; *Mode of Government*, p. 633, especially, note 152, which occupies two pages.

Bandelier states that the government of the clan, or *calpulli*, was in the hands of a clan council. This council, he says, was composed of important men who got their office by election. For none of these statements has he any proof. There is one passage in Sahagún⁴⁷ which would seem perhaps to imply the existence of something like a clan council. A council of the kin met to decide quarrels over land,⁴⁸ but it had no final authority. Altogether, evidence for the existence of a clan council, as a definite governing institution, is of a most vague and unsatisfactory sort. The best indication that something of the sort existed is a statement by Zúrita⁴⁹ that the "chief," whoever such

⁴² Clavigero, pp. 471, 472; Gómara, p. 436; Herrera, p. 135; Mendieta, pp. 156, 161; Torquemada, pp. 361, 366; Zúrita, pp. 47, 48.

⁴³ Gómara, Mendieta, Torquemada, as cited above; also Camargo, p. 176.

⁴⁴ Zúrita, p. 49.

⁴⁵ Des cérémonies observées, p. 233; Gómara, p. 436; Mendieta, p. 156; Zúrita, p. 28.

⁴⁶ See, for example, Boas in Report of U. S. National Museum for 1895, "The Social Organization and Secret Societies of the Kwakiutl Indians."

⁴⁷ Sahagún, p. 185.

⁴⁸ Zúrita, pp. 56, 62.

⁴⁹ Zúrita, pp. 55, 56, 60, 61, 62.

an officer may have been, did nothing without consulting the other old men of the *calpulli*. The council seems to have been a general assembly, for we are told that on occasions of importance the clan met as a whole.⁵⁰ In other words, what we have in Mexico is approximately what we find in the history of our own ancient ancestors, namely, that all matters, executive or judicial, pertaining to the group were settled in an undifferentiated folk-moot. If a more definitely organized governing body existed, there seems to be very little evidence of it in the sources.

Executive Officers of the Clan

Consult: *Art of War*, pp. 101, 119 and following; *Tenure of Land*, p. 425 and following; *Mode of Government*, pp. 591, 636 and following, 647 and following.

The most satisfying statement made by Morgan concerning Iroquois government is one to the effect that there was a primary specialization of offices into civil offices on the one hand and military offices on the other. This statement gives promise of reducing the whole governmental establishment to a definite system. Moreover, the specialization into leaders for war and leaders for peace seems to be logically a very early step in the evolution of government. In spite of this, Bandelier, in speaking of Mexican government, closes by assigning the civil and military leadership in the clan to one person.⁵¹ I am inclined to think that a case might be made out for a division of the clan offices into military and civil categories. Fuenleal, for example, says that there are two officers, "called *principales* or chiefs," in "each of the quarters which we today call parishes."⁵² He is borne out in this statement by Torquemada and Zúrita,⁵³ the former saying that each *barrio* or *parcialidad* (meaning almost certainly the clan, or *calpulli*) has two officers, a gatherer of stores and "a *regidor*, or *tecuhli*." The Simancas manuscript also speaks of *alcaldes* and *regidores* of the villages,⁵⁴ saying that an Aztec official called *achcacaulitis* was the *alcalde*, or judge, while the Aztec *achcacauhtin* was the *alguazil*, or sheriff. It is important, it seems to me, to recognize this differentiation in the offices of the clan.

⁵⁰ Zúrita, p. 62; Fuenleal, p. 249.

⁵¹ *Tenure of Land*, p. 425.

⁵² Fuenleal, p. 249.

⁵³ Torquemada, p. 544; Zúrita, p. 225.

⁵⁴ De l'ordre de succession, p. 225.

The War-Leader, or Achcacauhtin

One at least of the clan officers we can identify quite readily. His existence is very frequently mentioned. He enjoys, however, a wide variety of titles in the Spanish works. Some of the most important are shown in the following list. All of these titles *seem* to apply to one official.

TITLES APPLIED TO THE "CLAN WAR-LEADER" BY DIFFERENT AUTHORS

Title applied	Author
Pariente mayor ⁵⁵	Zúrita
Chief abbot	Mendieta
Alguacil mayor ⁵⁶	Torquemada
Leader in the fight	Tezozomoc
Captain of the people	Molina
Priest	Mendieta
Principal and master-at-arms	Tezozomoc
Chief of the quarter	Tezozomoc
Master of the youth	Tezozomoc
Teacher	
Captain of the guard	Torquemada
Prince	Clavigero
Old man	Fuenleal
Valiant man	Sahagún
Officer to whom the youths were entrusted	Clavigero
Captain	Tezozomoc
Regidor	Torquemada

It is obvious at once that to get any clear idea of the function of an officer who is called at once a captain of the guard and an abbot, involves some difficulty. The dignitary in question was evidently an official who had no counterpart in societies with which the Spaniards were familiar. His native title was *achcacauhtin*,⁵⁷ which means simply "elder brother." One of his duties was to lead the clan in battle⁵⁸ and to instruct the young men of the clan in warlike exercises.⁵⁹ These *achcacauhtins* got their office by election,⁶⁰ though the details of this election are quite uncertain.⁶¹ Perhaps this rather uncertain

⁵⁵ Zúrita says he was like the "pariente mayor" in the mountains of Biscay. I would not attempt to say what the term means.

⁵⁶ The exact implication of this word also is somewhat uncertain.

⁵⁷ De l'ordre de succession, etc., p. 225; Molina, p. 113; Sahagún, p. 305; Torquemada, p. 355; Tezozomoc, pp. 24, 25; Zúrita, p. 60.

⁵⁸ Authority almost entirely wanting. See Art of War, p. 119 and following.

⁵⁹ Tezozomoc, chs. 17, 38, 57.

⁶⁰ Molina, p. 113.

⁶¹ It is referred to in general terms in De l'ordre de succession, p. 225; Herrera, p. 125; Zúrita, p. 60.

evidence will at least enable us to conclude that there was a clan official called the "elder brother," who had duties in a general way of military sort, which he may have combined with ceremonial functions.

The Civil Officials

Consult: *Tenure of Land*, p. 425 and following; *Mode of Government*, pp. 637, 639 and following.

Mention is made in the sources of three different functions besides the one just mentioned: that of *calpullec*, or head of the clan; that of *tlatoani*, or "speaker," a sort of delegate who represented the interests of the clan in the larger assemblies; and that of "steward," or supervisor of stores. Bandelier insists that the *calpullec* and the "speaker" were different officers.⁶² Fuenleal, however, lumps them simply as "other officers called *viejos*."⁶³ Zúrita, moreover, says that the *calpullec* spoke for members of the *calpulli* "before the governors."⁶⁴ This particular passage would seem to suggest that the *calpullec* and the speaker were the same individual. While it is perhaps impossible to get a clear impression from the sources, it would certainly make the whole scheme of government appear more symmetrical to suppose that there was one clan official who looked out for all clan business that was not specifically military. Whether the Aztecs cared for symmetry in their government is, naturally, another question. Bandelier thinks that at least the *calpullec* and the "steward" may have been the same official.

With the word *calpullec* is associated the supervision and distribution of lands.⁶⁵ In this connection the *calpullec* kept records in the ancient picture-writing.⁶⁶ He seems to have supervised the stores of grain belonging to the kin or clan, for he is spoken of as "providing" food for the religious festivals.⁶⁷ One man could hardly have done so out of his private stores, so the statement probably implies that he had charge of public supplies. It is very likely that these supplies were in part in the nature of tribute from conquered groups. The office, whatever it implied, was held for life or good behavior,⁶⁸ and

⁶² *Mode of Government*, p. 639.

⁶³ P. 249.

⁶⁴ Pp. 60, 61, 62.

⁶⁵ Zúrita, pp. 61, 62.

⁶⁶ Clavigero, Book 7, ch. 14; Mendieta, p. 135; Sahagún, p. 304; Torquemada, p. 546.

⁶⁷ Herrera, p. 134; Zúrita, pp. 51-66.

⁶⁸ Herrera, p. 125; Zúrita, pp. 60, 61.

was vested in a man by election. According to Zúrita,⁶⁹ when a *calpullec* died they elected the most respected old man, who was often a son or other near relative of the former functionary.

There was undoubtedly an office known as that of *tlatoani*, or "speaker." Each of these "speakers" was elected by his own *calpulli*,⁷⁰ and while the tenure ordinarily was permanent, he could be removed, according to Zúrita,⁷¹ by the proper measures. The existence of "speakers" is referred to by several other authors.⁷² According to Bandelier, the tribal council consisted of the speakers from each clan, a total of twenty in all.⁷³ If these three offices were separate, there was certainly not much balance in the Aztec arrangement, since one military leader is offset by three civil officers. In any case, it is obvious that the clan was well provided with officials, and the clan itself constituted an important and highly functional element of the Aztec social order.

THE TRIBE AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENT

The Tribe and the Phratry

It is rather hard to present the facts in regard to the relation of the clans to Mexican society as a whole, for the reason that these clans entered into combinations of two different sorts. Twenty clans together made up the *tribe*, which was, from certain points of view, the next largest unit above the clan. The clans seem to have been directly active in tribal government. On the other hand, for certain ceremonial and military purposes, these clans are grouped into *phratries*, of which there were four in all. The term "phratry" does not occur in the sources, but it is the term which would probably be applied by modern ethnographers.⁷⁴ In the literature the units we have described as phratries are called "major quarters." For certain purposes, then, the clans were considered as a group of twenty (the *tribe*). For other purposes they were grouped into four large brotherhoods (the *phratries*). The usual notion is that the phratries were originally clans

⁶⁹ *Loc. cit.*

⁷⁰ Zúrita, p. 60.

⁷¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 61.

⁷² Bernal Diaz, p. 32; Molina, vol. 1, p. 108, vol. 2, p. 14; Pimentel, p. 174; Sahagún, p. 314; Torquemada, pp. 355, 626; Zúrita, p. 43.

⁷³ See below, MS p. 28.

⁷⁴ It is used already by Morgan, "Houses and House-Life of the American Aborigines," U. S. Department of the Interior, Contributions to North American Ethnology, IV, 14-15; Ancient Society, p. 157.

which divided, by segmentation, each into four or five, thus making the twenty clans as they were at the time of the Conquest. Even if this is their actual history, for purposes of presentation it is simpler to discuss first the tribe and its various officers, and proceed to the phratries later.

The Tribal Council

Consult: *Art of War*, pp. 101, 119 and following; *Tenure of Land*, p. 425 and especially note 16; *Art of War*, pp. 127-129 with notes, 160.

The Mexicans, as a tribe, are usually considered to have been ruled by a despot. The principal contribution of Morgan and Bandelier to the subject lies in their critical examination of this idea. The supreme authority, according to Bandelier, was vested, not in any despot, but in a "council" or "senate" of important men, one from each of the independent clans. These men, as far as their function in the council was concerned, were called *tlatoani*, or "speakers." This council, in Bandelier's opinion, is the most important thing in the Aztec governmental system.

It is characteristic of the sources that they say rather more about the condition of the Mexicans in the traditional period before the founding of the city than about the actual social order which was in existence at the time of the Conquest. Even statements concerning the Mexicans and their political arrangements while in the semi-mythical migration period are interesting. Although without historical value, such statements probably reflect later conditions, contemporaneous with the life of the authors. Conditions late in chronological order were probably read back into the semi-mythical period. Hence, when authors, in describing the period of wandering, refer to government by a council, it shows at least that the idea of a governing council was well known. The various statements concerning the number of councilors who, in the prehistoric period, made up this governing body are not in accord. Perhaps the best way of presenting the data is to put various references in the form of a tabulation. In passing, it

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL IN THE TRADITIONAL PERIOD,
ACCORDING TO DIFFERENT SOURCES

Author	Page	Number of members in the supreme council
Clavigero	190	20
Durán	47	10 (6 chiefs, 4 priests)
Durán	-----	7
García	Book 5, ch. 3	20
Mendieta	148	10
Tezozomoc	-----	7
Torquemada	94, 289, 290, 291	20

must be observed that a large number of authors mention no council at all in connection with this period, but picture the tribe as under the government of one chief, or king.

Whatever the facts about this traditional period may be, at the time of the Conquest there was almost certainly a council with important powers. The thousands of persons making up the tribe could not have congregated in one immense public gathering for the successful transaction of business. The idea that the authority of this council was supreme rests on a number of passages. They show that the "king," or chief, did not govern the tribe entirely on his own responsibility.⁷⁵

Admitting, for the sake of argument, that this council existed, its make-up is by no means clear. Sahagún, describing a council which met for the election of a war-chief, mentions that it was composed of "old men, officers, and medicine-men."⁷⁶ Torquemada, in one of the passages cited just above (note 75), mentions the fact that old women were also included.⁷⁷ This seems to mean, in other words, that anyone who considered himself of sufficient importance to have an opinion worth delivering might appear at the council and make himself heard. It is entirely possible that all actual formal decisions were announced by duly recognized officials. From what we know of Indian government elsewhere, it seems probable that these officials announced the popular verdict, instead of deciding each point on their own authority. The number of such duly recognized officials is variously given. Bernal Diaz mentions twenty "grand lords," a passage which sounds as though it might be a reference to a supreme council.⁷⁸ Durán, however, refers to "grand lords, *twelve* in number."⁷⁹ Ixtlilxochitl, as if bent on confusing the matter still more thoroughly, mentions *fourteen* "great lords."⁸⁰ Tezozomoc mentions first *twelve*, and then raises the number to *fifteen*.⁸¹ In view of the fact that twenty clans are more consistently mentioned than any other number, while there is at least some evidence for councilors to the number of twenty,

⁷⁵ Acosta, pp. 411, 477; De l'ordre de succession, p. 228; Diaz, pp. 191, 194; Durán, pp. 103, 108, 117, 1133; Fragmento 1, pp. 124, 125; Fragmento 2, p. 147; Gómara, p. 442; Herrera, p. 76; Mendieta, p. 129; Tezozomoc, pp. 11, 12, 13, 172; Torquemada, pp. 352, 537.

⁷⁶ Sahagún, p. 318.

⁷⁷ Torquemada, p. 537.

⁷⁸ Bernal Diaz, ch. 95; ch. 97, p. 99.

⁷⁹ Durán, p. 215.

⁸⁰ Ixtlilxochitl (a), p. 236.

⁸¹ Tezozomoc, p. 57.

it is perhaps safest to put two and two together and regard the council as made up of twenty clan representatives. At any rate, this is Bandelier's conclusion.

When we come to the question of how often the council met, the evidence is not quite so conflicting. The appropriate citations of authority may also be presented in the form of a table.

MEETINGS OF THE TRIBAL COUNCIL

Author	Page	Periodic meetings
Clavigero	482	Once every Mexican "month" (20 days)
Ixtlilxochitl	267, 268, 269	Every twenty days
Gómara	442	Once a month (every 30 days?)
Mendieta	135	Every ten or twelve days
Torquemada	355.	Every ten days ("later every twelve days")
Zúrita	101	Every twelve days

Meetings, however, could apparently be called in an emergency.⁸² Bernal Diaz mentions daily meetings during Cortés' first stay in Mexico.⁸³ I should say that we are entitled to conclude, on the basis of this evidence, that a council existed in ancient Mexico which had extremely wide powers. There is even a strong presumption that it constituted a higher authority than any other body or any individual.

The Head War-Chief

Consult: *Art of War*, pp. 123, 129; *Mode of Government*, pp. 588, 592, 645, 659, 666, 667, 668, 670; *Tenure of Land*, pp. 391, 397, 407.

As for the executive officers of the tribe, we can recognize at least two. There was certainly in the Mexican tribe an important leader whom we may call the Head War-Chief. The other official we will refer to in a moment. The existence of this head war-chief does not need to be discussed. All the literature on the Aztecs, even the oldest accounts, abounds in mention of various men who held the office. The last three of the list are actual historical characters and had official dealings with Cortés and the Spaniards. Question arises only with regard to the precise nature of their office. There is considerable evidence noted above, on page 263, that the council was above all other agencies of government. The war-chief in addition could not de-

⁸² Codex Ramírez, pp. 52, 62, 66, 67, 80; Fragmento 1, pp. 124, 127; Fragmento 2, pp. 137, 147.

⁸³ Diaz, p. 95.

clare war, which was the prerogative of the council.⁸⁴ Since that is the case, the head war-chief obviously was not a ruler, nor a despot, nor a monarch, in the European sense of the word. Another most important fact in connection with the possible question of supremacy between the council and the war-chief is the fact that the war-chief-tainship was an elective office. The fact that the war-chief was elected is common knowledge, and it is mentioned or referred to in practically all the literature.⁸⁵ The significance of this fact is often passed by. It certainly makes a sharp distinction between the Aztec leaders and the European monarchs of the same period. No real monarch can be elected, it seems to me, the example of the kings of Poland and the emperors of the Holy Roman Empire to the contrary notwithstanding. The kings of Poland were, as a matter of fact, kings only in name; and the same might be said with regard to the German emperors. The head war-chief had the title in Aztec of *tlacatecuhtli*, translated "chief of men." He was also known as "speaker" (*tlatoani*, degenerated sometimes to *tetuan*).⁸⁶ His principal office was to lead warriors to battle.⁸⁷ It may not be out of place to insist with Bandelier that the head war-chief was not a king.

The fact of election is amply supported.⁸⁸ One authority says that he was elected by the tribal council.⁸⁹ Sahagún, however, who gives much the fullest information on such points, says that the war-chief was elected by a "junta" of speakers, clan chiefs, old leaders, and priests, not by ballot, but unanimously.⁹⁰ Of the two, the latter statement seems much the more reasonable. It is supported by the Codex Mendoza,⁹¹ and by a statement in Durán.⁹² A similar statement is also made concerning the "kings" of Tezococo, a city which was a close neighbor and ally of Mexico.⁹³ Durán, in particular, emphasizes the

⁸⁴ Durán, p. 204; Tezozomoc, pp. 55, 56. The Codex Mendoza, pl. 67, is cited by Bandelier. The commentary on this plate (Kingsborough, vol. 6, p. 74) offers, however, nothing very conclusive.

⁸⁵ Cf. note 93.

⁸⁶ Fuenleal, p. 247; the "speaker" is described by Bandelier as one of the *civil* officials in the case of the clan.

⁸⁷ Acosta, p. 431; Mendieta, p. 132.

⁸⁸ For example, Acosta, p. 431; Clavigero, p. 463; Codex Mendoza, pl. 2; Codex Ramírez, p. 58; De l'ordre de succession, p. 228; Durán, pp. 103, 498; Mendieta, pp. 148, 153, 154; Sahagún, pp. 136-139, 318; Tezozomoc, pp. 142, 143; Torquemada, p. 358; Zárita, p. 14.

⁸⁹ De l'ordre de succession, p. 228.

⁹⁰ Sahagún, p. 318.

⁹¹ Codex Mendoza, pl. 2.

⁹² Durán, p. 53, describing the election of "Hummingbird," in the year 1396 (traditional chronology).

⁹³ Durán, p. 496; Ixtlilxochitl (*a*), chs. 76, 88; Mendieta, p. 153; Pomar; Sahagún, p. 318, Book 8, ch. 30; Tezozomoc, chs. 101, 102; Torquemada, pp. 357, 358, 359.

importance of election, and the non-operation of the principle of heredity, in Indian government.⁹⁴ He is borne out by Vetancurt, Torquemada, and Zúrita.⁹⁵ Bandelier has some evidence, therefore, for his statement that the Mexican leaders were not kings.

If the head war-chief was elected, the question at once arises: Who were eligible for the office? The fact is that the choice was limited to one group, which consisted of a whole family or lineage. This is stated by a large number of good authorities.⁹⁶ Durán, according to Bandelier,⁹⁷ states emphatically that a son did not follow his father in office, unless duly elected to it. Pomar says concerning the Tezcucans that they elected, as war-chief, any one of an entire kin.⁹⁸ The best evidence of all in this connection is the actual list of war-chiefs, in which men are not by any means regularly followed in office by their sons. The sons of such officials, moreover, were brought up as private citizens, not as heirs-apparent to an office. They became singers or followed other professions.⁹⁹ To put the facts briefly, the office of head war-chief was actually elective, but at the same time it was hereditary within a group. The nature of this group is not clear. It may even have been some certain one of the clans.

Bandelier makes much of the point that the last head war-chief, Montezuma, was deprived of his office by the Mexicans. There is little question about the facts.¹⁰⁰ The circumstances, however, were altogether unusual. The Spaniards were in the city, and Montezuma was in their power and was prevented from discharging his office. Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that they chose another leader. The fact does not prove the existence of machinery for the "recall" of an unpopular war leader. Herrera says that among the Quiche there was a "king," but that the heads of families had a right to put him to death for misdemeanor.¹⁰¹ The existence of such a custom in connection with a "king" would indicate that the Spaniards did not mean to be taken literally in their application of the word to Indian

⁹⁴ Durán, pp. 103 and 490 especially.

⁹⁵ Vetancurt, quoted in Kingsborough, VIII, 124; Torquemada, pp. 358, 359; Zúrita, pp. 18, 19.

⁹⁶ Acosta, pp. 439, 440; Clavigero, p. 463; Codex Ramírez, p. 58; Durán, pp. 103, 498, 499; Sahagún, p. 318; Torquemada, p. 358; Zúrita, pp. 12, 14.

⁹⁷ Durán, p. 103, cited just above.

⁹⁸ The passage is not cited by Bandelier, and it is contradicted by Torquemada, pp. 357, 358, 359.

⁹⁹ Sahagún, Book 5, ch. 3; Tezozomoc, p. 143.

¹⁰⁰ Bernal Díaz, p. 132; Cortés, pp. 41, 42; Codex Ramírez, p. 89; Fragmento 2, p. 143; Herrera, pp. 264, 267; Las Casas, p. 49; Sahagún, pp. 28, 29; Torquemada, pp. 494, 497; Vetancurt, pp. 125, 130, 131.

¹⁰¹ Herrera, p. 386.

affairs. The existence of the right to kill a king certainly involves a logical contradiction. *not an old Spanish law, which he had probably*

Duality of the Office

Another interesting point about the office of war-chief, which makes clear the fact that it is not comparable to a monarchical institution, is that the office was dual. Alongside of the "chief of men" there was another official with practically equal powers. The second official held the extraordinary title of "Snake-Woman." The custom of having two chief officials seems to be quite typical of the plateau tribes, and perhaps of Middle-American societies in general. For example, there were two head chiefs in Tlascala.¹⁰² The same might be said of Xochimilco,¹⁰³ of Chalco,¹⁰⁴ of the Totonacs,¹⁰⁵ and of the tribes of Guatemala.¹⁰⁶ At Matlatzincó, according to Zúrita,¹⁰⁷ there were three chiefs who held office by turns. It is stated by one historian that this duality or plurality in leadership was common to every Mexican tribe.¹⁰⁸ It was the custom among the Iroquois, as is well known, to appoint an assistant or helper for each important official.

The "Snake-Woman"

Consult: *Art of War*, p. 124; *Social Organization*, pp. 660-667.

We know relatively little about the "Snake-Woman," or coadjutor to the head war-chief, except that the office existed. No plausible explanation has ever been offered for the extraordinary title. I think the first point to be emphasized is that the snake-woman was apparently equal to the "king," or head war-chief, in rank. This is stated by a number of good authorities.¹⁰⁹ (See *Social Organization*, p. 665, note 221.) He is referred to as "coadjutor to the king," or "second king."¹¹⁰ Moreover, certain insignia were common to these two offi-

¹⁰² Anonymous Conqueror, p. 388; Bernal Diaz, p. 60; Cortés, pp. 18, 46; Gómara, p. 332; Motolinia, pp. 229, 230; Oviedo, p. 372; Tezozomoc, pp. 150, 152; Torquemada, p. 347 (mentions four, not two).

¹⁰³ Durán, p. 104; Tezozomoc, p. 25.

¹⁰⁴ Bernal Diaz, pp. 154, 155; Durán, p. 134; Tezozomoc, pp. 33, 36.

¹⁰⁵ Durán, pp. 181, 206.

¹⁰⁶ Bernal Diaz, p. 220 (see also the *Popul Vuh*, Paris, edited by Brasseur de Bourbourg, 1861, p. 339).

¹⁰⁷ Zúrita, p. 389.

¹⁰⁸ Herrera, p. 141; confirmed by Tezozomoc.

¹⁰⁹ Acosta, p. 494; Codex Ramírez, p. 66; Durán, pp. 215, 255; Fragmento 1; Tezozomoc, pp. 53, 58, 66; Torquemada, p. 352; Vetancurt, p. 369.

¹¹⁰ By the Codex Ramírez, Durán, and Tezozomoc, especially.

cials, and were worn by no others. Among them was the *copilli*,¹¹¹ the so-called royal crown (a curious head-ornament of metal, rising over the forehead), and a certain style of dress.¹¹² Both the chief of men and the snake-woman had commemorative carvings,¹¹³ and the same burial rites.¹¹⁴ The snake-woman did not, however, have precisely the same functions. We are quite uncertain, as a matter of fact, just what his functions were. The Spaniards applied to the office various terms, which may perhaps be presented in tabular form.

TITLES APPLIED TO THE "SNAKE WOMAN" BY THE SPANIARDS

Title given	Author	Page
Coadjutor to the king	Codex Ramírez	*
Coadjutor to the king	Durán	*
Coadjutor to the king	Tezozomoc	48
Viceroy	Torquemada	352
Viceroy	Vetancurt	369
Supreme judge	Clavigero	481
Supreme judge	Codex Mendoza	pl. 69
Supreme judge	Torquemada	352
Supreme judge	Vetancurt	369
Mayordomo	Bernal Diaz	87
Captain-General	Cortés	89, 90
Captain-General	Gómara	392
Captain-General	Tezozomoc	48
Principal councilor and lieutenant	Herrera	53
Principal councilor and lieutenant	Tezozomoc	57
Captain	Torquemada	567
General and auditor	Tezozomoc	32
Presidente	Tezozomoc	48
Governor of Mexico	Relación de Jornada	315, 471

* See *Mode of Government*, note 210.

It is very hard to form a clear impression of an officer whose function corresponded at once to that of captain-general and that of supreme judge. It is very probable that the snake-woman, whatever else his functions, was particularly in charge of the gathering and housing of tribute.¹¹⁵ During the siege of the city by the Spaniards, Montezuma commanded the confederate tribes who were fighting the Spaniards, while the snake-woman led the local Mexican forces.¹¹⁶

¹¹¹ Durán, p. 214.

¹¹² Clavigero, Book 7, ch. 22; Codex Telleriano-Remensis; Durán, p. 215; Tezozomoc, pp. 57, 115, 129.

¹¹³ Durán, pp. 250, 251; Tezozomoc, p. 65.

¹¹⁴ Acosta, p. 496; Codex Ramírez, p. 381; Durán, p. 381.

¹¹⁵ Durán, pp. 172, 173; Tezozomoc, pp. 45, 64, 65, 104, 110, 111, 119.

¹¹⁶ Cortés, p. 89.

The last snake-woman to hold the office was appointed governor of the City of Mexico under the Spaniards by Cortés.¹¹⁷ It would be logically the most satisfying course to assume that there was a division of function between the two highest officers, as there was possibly in the case of the clan officers. For example, it would be a scheme easy to understand if the head war-chief had exercised primarily military leadership, while the snake-woman was essentially a civil officer, with the administration of tribute gathering and other public matters in his hands. The evidence, however, does not so indicate. At any rate, the existence of an officer who shared the prerogatives and the authority of the head war-chief adds tremendously to the probability that the latter official was not a "royal" person.

A question of some theoretical interest is this: Did the bilateral segmentation of Aztec officialdom into *civil* and *military* functionaries extend to the high officers of the tribe? The answer is that it did not. There is no reference to any civil officer corresponding to the head war-chief. The reason, when we reflect a moment, is not far to seek. The tribe, namely, had no civil business. It owned no land, collected no internal taxes, made no expenditures, never interfered in the affairs of the clans. In other words, the only business in which the tribe engaged as a unit was war. There was no need for any tribal officer except the war leader. The snake-woman is certainly not a civil officer, but a military one, and is to be recognized as the understudy of the war-chief. Everything in and about his office, even his personal ornaments, points to his partnership in the war-chief's duties. In other words, a point to be always emphasized is the purely military purpose and intent of all the Mexican efforts towards the organization of a government.

THE "FOUR QUARTERS," OR PHRATRIES

The fact that the ancient City of Mexico was divided into four districts is well known, and it is accepted, I believe, quite generally.¹¹⁸ These "major quarters" were divided into a number of independent clans, probably twenty in all (see above, p. 255). The fact that the "major quarter" is a group of clans is indicated quite clearly.¹¹⁹ The question as to what function the "major quarter" had, as a unit of

¹¹⁷ Bernal Diaz, pp. 198, 199; Cortés, p. 110; Herrera, pp. 122, 123; Ixtlil-xochitl (*b*), pp. 265, 266, 269.

¹¹⁸ Acosta, p. 467; Clavigero, p. 494; Durán, p. 42; Gómara, p. 434; Herrera, p. 61; Vetancurt, p. 124.

¹¹⁹ See especially Durán, Torquemada, Vetancurt, as cited above.

the social order, still remains. We know that it was very important in military affairs.¹²⁰ Moreover, it had certain religious functions. Each such "quarter," for example, had its own god and place for worship.¹²¹ A group of clans for ceremonial and military purposes deserves, it seems to me, to be called a "phratry." Moreover, the word *calpulli*, which implies kinship, is applied also to these four quarters,¹²² indicating that these were based on notions of common descent. That these "four quarters," or "major quarters," of the Spanish historians were very important institutions is shown by the fact that they persisted in the City of Mexico for a very long time after the Conquest. They were perpetuated in the four city wards of San Pablo, San Juan, Santa Maria la Redonda, and San Sebastian, which were simply the old quarters, known to the Indians as Teopan, Aztacalco, Moyotlan, and Cupepopan.¹²³ It was at one time intended to concentrate the Indian population in the old pueblo of Tlaltelolco, which was known as the "ward" of Santiago. The most interesting thing about these "major quarters" is the fact of the existence of a great war leader for each one, an official who is most commonly referred to as the "captain-general" (though the use of this term is not restricted to the one official in question). It remains to discuss the functions and rank of these officers.

The "Captains-General," or Phratry-Commanders

Consult: *Art of War*, p. 121; *Mode of Government*, pp. 688-690.

The existence of these four conspicuous officials is referred to, though their titles are given somewhat differently by a number of authors.¹²⁴ There is little question about their identity. Bandelier states, on fairly good authority, that they were elected,¹²⁵ and, he thinks, by the population of each of the "four quarters." Each one had a special title or official name. In other words, as in the case of the Iroquois, a certain name went with the occupancy of the office. These four names, given differently by different authors, help to iden-

¹²⁰ Clavigero, p. 494; Tezozomoc, p. 161; Torquemada, *loc. cit.*; also see below, under "Captain-General."

¹²¹ Durán, p. 42.

¹²² For example, Tezozomoc, p. 184.

¹²³ Durán, p. 42; Tezozomoc, p. 98; Vetancurt, p. 42.

¹²⁴ Acosta, p. 441; Clavigero, Book 7, ch. 21; Codex Ramírez, pp. 57, 58; Durán, pp. 102, 103; Herrera, p. 75; Sahagún, pp. 318, 319; Tezozomoc, pp. 24, 161.

¹²⁵ Acosta, Codex Ramírez, Durán, Herrera, Sahagún, as cited just above, note 124.

tify the officials, when mentioned in different places in our sources. They are, as given by Bandelier, *Tlacateccatl*, or "cutter of men"; *Tlacocheacatl*, or "man of the storehouse of weapons"; *Ezhuahuacatl*, or "he who sheds blood"; and perhaps *Quauhnochtli*, or "eagle and caetus chief." Three passages prove to Bandelier's satisfaction that the four were immediate assistants to the head war-chief.¹²⁶ If this is true, their main function was undoubtedly warlike. A variety of titles are applied to them, however. Among other things, they are referred to as "judges."¹²⁷ "Alcalde" is another Spanish term which to many Spanish authors seemed applicable to the official in question.¹²⁸ Taking everything into consideration, we are evidently dealing with a somewhat undifferentiated office, in which military leadership was the most important factor.

As regards their dress, these four men were allowed to tie the hair with red leather, a thing which was otherwise permitted only to the head war-chief and the snake-woman. Another point of extreme importance is this, that (according to fairly good authority) the head war-chief was invariably elected from among these four.¹²⁹ We have already considered the idea that the chief of men had to be elected from one lineage. If this second principle was also in operation, the four phratry-captains must obviously have belonged, in each case, to the same lineage. Otherwise they would not have been eligible for election to the office. Of the authors just mentioned (note 139), Durán is very explicit.

Mention ought to be made of the fact that some of the sources speak not of four officers, whom we may assume to be captains-general, but of two.¹³⁰ It seems plausible, however, that four was the actual number, corresponding to the four quarters.

Other Institutions in the Phratry

The tribe seems to have had a public house, where the head war-chief and other important men lived, and where a great deal of official business went forward. This was called the tribal *tecpan* (consult *Mode of Government*, pp. 648, 655). Bandelier makes much of the point that the so-called "palace" of Montezuma was merely the official

¹²⁶ Codex Ramírez, pp. 57, 58; Durán, p. 103; Sahagún, p. 318.

¹²⁷ Clavigero, p. 481; Torquemada, p. 352; Vetancurt, p. 370.

¹²⁸ Codex Mendoza, pl. 59.

¹²⁹ Acosta, pp. 431, 441; Codex Mendoza, pl. 11; Codex Ramírez, p. 58; Durán, p. 103; Tezozomoc, ch. 15 (confirms vaguely); Torquemada, pp. 172, 186.

¹³⁰ Gómara, p. 442; Sahagún, p. 311; Zúrita, p. 95.

tribal administration building. Similar buildings may have existed in each major quarter.

Two other institutions connected with the quarter might hold our attention for a moment. One was a place called by Bandelier the "schoolhouse," where youths were trained, "under the supervision of the clan leaders," for war. The other was an armory, a "house of darts," which seems to have been immediately under the supervision of the phratry-captain. Statements concerning the "schoolhouses" may be found in various authors.¹³¹ It is noteworthy that the clan official did the teaching, but the schoolhouse was an establishment belonging to the "major quarter," or phratry. The existence of four houses of darts, one for each major quarter, or phratry, is mentioned by one author.¹³² Others are not so explicit.¹³³ They seem to have existed, however, and to have been found in the neighborhood of the temples,¹³⁴ probably because the temples and other public buildings were grouped together. The "darts" spoken of were undoubtedly the javelins hurled by means of the characteristic Mexican weapon, the *atlatl*, or spear-thrower.¹³⁵ Torquemada speaks of a special house, at the Main Temple, reserved for javelins, and nothing else.¹³⁶ Altogether it can be seen that phratries had a rather definite and active function in the Mexican social order.

POINTS OF DIFFICULTY

A great many points are brought up by Bandelier concerning which we have no satisfactory information. We know, for example, that Mexico and two allied pueblos, Tezcoco and Tlacopan, exacted a relatively heavy tribute from many surrounding places. The collection and forwarding of this tribute imply the existence of an extensive business organization. There are many references to the *calpixca*, or "stewards," who were engaged in this work, but there is very little to show us the precise nature of their appointment and

¹³¹ Gómara, p. 438; Mendieta, p. 124; Sahagún, p. 268; Tezozomoc, pp. 121, 134; Torquemada, p. 185.

¹³² Tezozomoc, p. 184.

¹³³ Bernal Diaz, vol. 2, p. 87, says "two"; Gómara, p. 345, and Herrera, p. 197, say "several"; Motolinia, p. 188, says "many."

¹³⁴ Acosta, Book 6, ch. 28; Anonymous Conqueror, p. 394; Gómara, vol. 2, p. 349; Tezozomoc, p. 121; Torquemada, p. 146.

¹³⁵ Mrs. Zelia Nuttall, in Peabody Museum (Harvard University), Anthropological Papers, vol. 1.

¹³⁶ Torquemada, p. 146.

procedure. Bandelier devotes considerable space to these *calpixca*, but after all achieves nothing very definite. (See *Mode of Government*, especially pp. 638, 697.) We know that the tribute was collected, that it was forwarded to the confederate towns, and that it was divided up among the allies, Mexico and Tezcoco taking each two-fifths, and Tlacopan receiving one-fifth. We have a suspicion that this tribute was finally parcelled out to the clans and not to individuals. The exact facts in connection with the gathering of tribute are a most promising field for investigation. Another extremely interesting question, which is closely allied to the one just mentioned, is the question of trade routes and avenues of commerce. There is reason to believe that there was a lively commerce in highly specialized products between various localities on the Plateau. The actual tracing of the important trails and other arteries of commerce ought to be practicable, and it is certainly most necessary.

We ought to have a list of the names applied to the clans, or *calpullis*. The whole matter of totemism ought also to be thoroughly explored. Analogy with the Iroquois, together with the attire worn by Mexican warriors, would suggest that these clans might quite possibly have exhibited certain totemistic phenomena. Nothing has ever been done with the question whether or not the Mexican clans were exogamous. All these points could probably be worked out on the basis of the source material.

A totally different point which ought to be investigated is the question of the nature and workings of the Confederacy, to the existence of which allusion has just been made. Mexico seems to have enjoyed the right of furnishing a leader for each confederate enterprise, this leader being normally her own head war-chief. This fact tends to make an additional distinction between this official of the Mexicans and the ordinary war-chief of ordinary Indian tribes. The Confederacy was really superimposed on the already existing local organization of each tribe, and its workings ought to prove most interesting.

CONCLUSION

The following tabulation indicates the composition of Mexican society as viewed by Bandelier. Under the headings are listed the institutions and functions characterizing (in his opinion) each division of the social order.

Olan	Phratry	Tribe
War-party	War-party	War-party
War-leader (Elder Brother)	War-leader (Phratry captain)	War-leader ("King")
Religious observances	Religious observances	Religious observances
Official buildings	Official buildings	Official buildings
Council	Council
Temple
Steward
Calpullec
Speaker
Lands

In summing up Bandelier's findings, several points are to be borne in mind. It is perfectly obvious, in the first place, that arguments cannot be based on the descriptive terminology used by the Spanish authors of the sixteenth century, not even when these authors were eye-witnesses of what they describe. When Spanish authors define the same Indian official as being at once a bailiff and a general, or a captain of the guard and an abbot, we are obviously helpless to make up our minds what the official really was. There are several possible explanations for the uncertainties in the Spanish accounts, all of which probably apply in some measure. The offices the Spaniards were describing were not exactly analogous to anything in the Old World. Probably, also, these Indian offices were somewhat undifferentiated. An "official" who is mentioned as holding office was probably in the main merely an important man. One day he might be leading a party to war, and the next day taking an important rôle in a religious ceremony, or exerting influence in a way which made him look to the Spaniards like a judge. Of the various reasons for confusion and uncertainty, this lack of specialization in functions seems to be probably the most important.

What applies to the less important officials, applies with greater force to the most important dignitary of all, the head war-chief. Whether he is to be called a king or not depends on the meaning which this term carries. The office was, however, elective, and for that and other reasons, "king" is probably not the term to use. The conclusion to which the evidence obviously points is that the Aztec war-chief was probably well started on the road to becoming a king, but had not yet arrived. A most significant point is that the leadership was shared. This is true also of the government of tribes in the United States, where there was often a board of four or more "chiefs" who directed affairs. It would be possible fully to understand the government of

ancient Mexico only by making a comparative study of government among tribes in the eastern United States (especially the Iroquois), on the Plains and, above all, among the Pueblos of the Southwest, where we are almost certain to find conditions that may be compared with those in Tenochtitlan.

In a more general way still, there were fundamental differences between Indian and Spanish society which the Spaniards never seem to have understood. The ownership of land, to mention the most important kind of property, was vested not in individuals but in the clan. This fact the Spaniards were slow to grasp. The Spaniards also viewed the whole of Mexican tribal society as a unit subdivided into four quarters, and each quarter further subdivided, for administrative purposes, into clans, or *calpullis*. The facts probably are that the Indians regarded the clans as the essential thing, while the four quarters, or phratries, and in still larger measure the tribe, were merely loose aggregates of clans held together primarily for the purposes of war, and, after that, of ritual. The fundamental point which Bandelier makes, that Spanish society was essentially feudal, while Indian society was essentially democratic, is, it seems to me, a good one.

The question, therefore, whether Mexican society was monarchical or democratic seems to me to be largely an artificial one. Mexico, for example, is regularly described in works concerning the Aztecs as a monarchy; Tlascala as a republic. Republic (*res publica*) is a word which could not, as used by the early writers, have had its modern sense; moreover, it was actually applied to both cities alike.¹³⁷ There is not the slightest critical reason for drawing any distinction between the mode of government of the two. The distinction is an accidental one. Mexico was certainly as much of a republic as Tlascala was. A great deal of the talk about Mexico being a monarchy, especially the highly colored talk, could probably be traced back to Ixtlilxochitl. He seems to have been moved by a desire to glorify his maternal ancestors, who were war-chiefs of Tezcoco, and to establish royal rank for the family. He uses a feudal terminology, even in speaking of the most ancient periods, when the peoples he describes were, according to his own words, naked hunters.¹³⁸

Many problems are suggested by Bandelier for which the necessary data are so far lacking. The actual details of Mexican organization

¹³⁷ Torquemada, p. 361.

¹³⁸ Ixtlilxochitl (*a*), pp. 30, 66.

might still be recovered, in large measure, through a study of the manuscript material, more and more of which is becoming available. This involves, however, an exhaustive knowledge of its contents. Bandelier's work, it seems to me, is a good beginning, and offers the proper foundation for a final study of Mexican society.

Bandelier's positive contributions to the subject may be summed ~~This involves, however, an exhaustive knowledge of their contents.~~ up as follows. He cites evidence which proves conclusively that the social organization of Tenochtitlan was based on clans, that these clans were grouped in four phratries, and that the actions of the tribe as a whole were governed primarily by a council. The "kings" he shows clearly to be the executive agents, in a very real sense, of this council, and responsible through them to the people. He brings forward a good deal of evidence in support of his dictum that Mexican society was fundamentally democratic.

The remainder of the points made in his paper are unsatisfactory in the present state of the evidence. The question of the importance of "honorary chiefs" and the question of the existence of separate clan councils as governmental institutions are still entirely open. The function of the "elder brother," or war leader in the clan, and his relation to other clan officials, must remain quite problematical. Bandelier cannot be said to have achieved anything conclusive in regard to the whole matter of clan officials. The relation of Bandelier's work to Morgan's is very close. Morgan arrived at certain conclusions, without having a very wide knowledge of the evidence in the sources. He quotes only nine sixteenth-century authors. Bandelier backs up Morgan's conclusions by a rather wide study of the sources, as the following bibliography will show. He may be regarded as finally confirming the most important of Morgan's conclusions.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF THE SOURCES CITED BY BANDELIER

Showing the dates of composition

It is difficult to say definitely when each of these works was composed. The dates which are given in the appended list often indicate merely the approximate period. It must be remembered that this list includes only the original works cited by Bandelier, and not the modern works to which he makes reference. It is not in any sense a bibliography of the subject.

ACAZITLI, FRANCISCO DE SANDOVAL

Relación de la jornada . . . del pueblo de Tlalmanalco, etc. (Written in 1641.)

Mexico (*in* Icazbalceta, Colección de documentos para la historia de México, 2 vols., 1858-1866, vol. 2), 1866.

ACOSTA, JOSÉ DE SALAMÁN

Historia natural y moral de las Indias. (Composed about 1588.)
Seville, 1608.

ALVARADO, PEDRO DE

Relación a Hernando Cortés. (Written in 1524.)

Madrid, edited by Vedia (*in* Historiadores primitivos de Indias, 2 vols., included as vols. 22 and 26 of the Biblioteca de autores Españoles, 71 vols., various editors, 1849-1880, vol. 22), 1868.

ANONYMOUS CONQUEROR

Relación de algunas cosas de Nueva España y de la Gran Ciudad de Temestitan de México. (Composed "soon after the Conquest.")

Mexico (*in* Icazbalceta, Colección de Documentos para la Historia de México, 2 vols.), 1858-1860.

ANUNCIACIÓN, DOMINGO DE LA

Lettre. (Written in Chalco, September 20, 1554.)

Paris (*in* Ternaux-Compans, Voyages, 20 vols., 1837-1841, vol. 16 [i.e., Series 2, vol. 6]), 1840.

BIBLIOTECA MEXICANA

The work cited by Bandelier under this very misleading title is an edition of the *Crónica Mexicana* of Fernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc. This edition was annotated by Orozco y Berra and contains also the *Codex Ramírez* and two "fragmentos," very frequently referred to by our author. The volume, including the *Crónica Mexicana* and its companion pieces, seems to constitute number 69 in a series the general title of which is as given, *Biblioteca Mexicana*. This title does not, however, appear in the usual works of reference.

BOLOGNA, FRANCISCO DE

Lettre au Reverend Padre Clement de Monelia. (Written before 1534.)

Paris (*in* Ternaux-Compans, Voyages, 20 vols., 1837-1841, vol. 10), 1840.

CAMARGO, DOMINGO MUÑOZ

Histoire de la republique de Taxcallan. (Written 1576-1585.)

Paris, edited by Ternaux-Compans (*in* Nouvelles Annales des Voyages, 160 vols., various editors, 1819, vols. 95 and 99), 1843.

CHAVEZ, GABRIEL DE

Rapport sur la Province de Meztitlan. (Written October 1, 1569.)

Paris (*in* Ternaux-Compans, Voyages, 20 vols., 1837-1841, vol. 16 [i.e., Series 2, vol. 6]), 1840.

CLAVIGERO, FRANCISCO SEVERIO

Storia antica de Messico. (Composed about 1765.)

Cesena, 1780.

Codex Mendoza.

London (*in* Kingsborough, Mexican Antiquities, 9 vols.), 1831.
(Note.—The original painting is in vol. 1, pp. 1-73, the original Spanish commentary in vol. 5, pp. 39-113, and an English translation of the Spanish commentary in vol. 6, pp. 3-87.)

Codex Ramírez (so-called). In Tezozomoc, *Crónica Mexicana* . . . anotada por . . . M. Orozco y Berra, y precidida del Códice Ramírez, manuscrito intitulado: Relación del origen de los Indios que habitan esta Nueva España según sus historias, y de un examen de ambas obras, al cual va anexo un estudio de cronología Mexicana por el mismo . . . Orozco y Berra.

Mexico (*in* Biblioteca Mexicana. Colección de obras y documentos relativos a la historia . . . de México, No. 69), 1878.

Codex Telleriano-Remensis.

London (*in* Kingsborough, *Mexican Antiquities*, 9 vols.), 1831. (Note.—The original picture-writing is reproduced in vol. 1, pp. 73-166, the Spanish commentary in vol. 5, pp. 129-158, and an English translation of the Spanish commentary in vol. 6, pp. 95-153.)

Concilios Provinciales, Primero y Segundo, celebrados por la muy noble y muy leal ciudad de México, etc., etc.

Mexico, 1769.

Conquista de México. See Gómara.

CORTÉS, HERNANDO

Cartas. (Written at different times from 1519 to 1526.)

Madrid, edited by Vedia (*in* *Historiadores primitivos de Indias*, 2 vols., issued as vols. 22 and 26 of the Biblioteca de autores Españoles, 71 vols., 1849-1880), 1877.

Cuarta relación anónima de la jornada que hizo Nuño de Guzman a la Nueva Galicia. (Written about 1530.)

Mexico (*in* Icazbalceta, *Colección de documentos para la historia de México*, 2 vols., 1858-1866, vol. 2, pp. 260-485), 1866.

Des cérémonies observés autrefois par les Indiens lorsqu'ils faisaient un teele (anonymous).

Paris (*in* Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages*, 20 vols., 1837-1841, vol. 10, pp. 233-241), 1840.

De l'ordre de succession observé par les Indiens relativement à leurs terres et de leurs territoires communaux (anonymous).

Paris (*in* Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages*, 20 vols., 1837-1841, vol. 10), 1840.

DÍAZ DEL CASTILLO, BERNAL

Verdadera historia de los sucesos de la conquista de la Nueva España. (Composed in 1552, some authorities say 1568.)

Madrid, edited by Vedia (*in* *Historiadores primitivos de Indias*, 2 vols., issued as vols. 21 and 26 of the Biblioteca de autores Españoles, 71 vols., various editors, 1849-1880, vol. 26), 1862.

London, edited by Maudslay (*in* *Works* issued by the Hakluyt Society, Series 2, vols. 23, 24, 25), 1908.

DURÁN, DIEGO

Historia de las Indias de Nueva España. (Composed in 1579-1581.)

Mexico (edited by Ramírez), 1867. (First volume only. The remainder was confiscated by the newly installed Republican government on the fall of Maximilian. The text of this edition is said to have been tampered with.)

ESLAVA, FERNAN GONZALES DE

Coloquios espirituales y sacramentales, y poesías sagradas. (Written before 1610.)

Mexico (edited by Icazbalceta), 1877. (Only 200 copies printed.)

Fragmento 1. See *Noticias relativas al reinado de Motecuzuma Ilhuicamina*.

Fragmento 2. See *Noticias relativas a la conquista desde la llegada de Cortés a Tetzcuca*, etc.

FUENLEAL, SEBASTIAN RAMÍREZ DE

Carta (addressed November 3, 1552, to the Emperor Charles V).

Paris (*in* Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages*, 20 vols., 1837-1841, vol. 10), 1840.

GARCÍA, GREGORIO

Origen de los Indios del Nuevo Mundo y Indias Occidentales. (Date of composition not ascertained.)

Madrid, edited by Barcia (*in* *Historiadores primitivos de las Indias occidentales*, 3 vols., 1727-1740), 1729.

GÓMARA, FRANCISCO LOPEZ DE

Historia general de las Indias. (Note.—The second part of this work goes under the title "Conquista de Méjico," and is so cited by Bandelier.) (Composed about 1550.)

Madrid, edited by Vedia (*in* *Historiadores primitivos de Indias*, 2 vols., issued as vols. 22 and 26 of the *Biblioteca de autores Españoles*, 71 vols., various editors, 1849-1880), 1877.

HERRERA, ANTONIO DE

Historia general de los hechos de los Castellanos en las islas y tierra firme del mar oceano. (Composed between 1596 and 1600.)

Madrid, edited by Barcia (*in* *Historiadores primitivos de las Indias occidentales*, 3 vols., 1727-1740), 1749.

IXTLILXOCHITL, HERNANDO DE ALVA

(a) *Historia Chichimeca*. (Composed 1608-1616.)

Paris (*in* Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages*, 20 vols., 1837-1841, vols. 12 and 13 [i.e., Series 2, vols. 2 and 3]), 1840.

(b) *Relaciones históricas*. (Composed 1608-1616.)

Paris (*in* Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages*, 20 vols., 1837-1841, vol. 8), 1838. (Note.—Only the thirteenth *Relación* is printed here, under the name *Cruautés horribles des conquérants de Mexico*. This curious name was invented by Bustamente, in his edition of Sahagún [Mexico, 1829]. The Ternaux-Compans reprint is the one cited by Bandelier.)

LAS CASAS, BARTOLOMÉ DE

(a) *Brevissima relación de la destrucción de las Indias*. (Composed 1541-1542.)

Venetia, 1643.

(b) *Historia de las Indias*. (Composed 1527-1562.)

Madrid (*in* *Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España*, 112 vols., various editors, published by the Royal Academy of History, 1842-1895, vols. 62-66), 1875-1876. (Note.—The so-called *Historia Apologética* of Las Casas is printed in vol. 66, beginning with p. 237 of this set. Chapter 211 of the *Historia* is also printed in full in vol. 8 of Kingsborough's *Mexican Antiquities* [9 vols., London, 1831, vol. 8 (first part), pp. 248-254]. This latter excerpt is referred to by Bandelier.)

Lettre des auditeurs Salmeron, Maldonado, Ceynos et Queroga à l'Impératrice de Mexico. (Written in Mexico, March 30, 1531.)

Paris (*in* Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages*, 20 vols., 1837-1841, vol. 16 [i.e., Series 2, vol. 6]), 1840.

- ✓ *Lettre des chapelains Frère Toribio et Frère Diego d'Olarte à Don Luis de Velasco.*
(Written August 27, 1554.)
Paris (*in* Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages*, vol. 10), 1840.
- ✓ MARTYR, PETER (PIETRO MARTIRE D'ANGHERA)
De novo orbe. (Written 1505-1530.)
London (translated by Eden and Lok), 1612.
- ✓ MENDIETA, GERÓNIMO DE
Historia eclesiástica Indiana. (Composed 1573-1596.)
Mexico (*in* Icazbalceta, Colección de documentos para la historia de México, 2 vols.), 1858-1860.
- ✓ MENDOZA, ANTONIO DE
Avis du Vice-Roi . . . sur les prestations personnelles et les tamemes. (Written in 1550.)
Paris (*in* Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages*, 20 vols., 1837-1841, vol. 10), 1838.
- ✓ *Merced a Hernán Cortés de tierras inmediatas a México, y solares en la ciudad.*
(Written July 23, 1529.)
Mexico (*in* Icazbalceta, Colección de documentos para la historia de México, 2 vols.), 1858-1860.
- MOLINA, ALONZO DE
Vocabulario en lengua Mexicana y Castellana. (Composed about 1550.)
Mexico, 1571.
- ✓ MONTUFAR, ALONZO DE
Supplique à Charles V en faveur des Maceuales. (Written in Mexico, November 30, 1554.)
Paris (Appendix to the "Cruautés Horribles" of Ixtlilxochitl, *in* Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages*, 20 vols., 1837-1841, vol. 8), 1838.
- ✓ MOTOLINIA (TORIBIO DE BENEVENTE)
Historia de los Indios de Nueva España. (Composed in 1541.)
Mexico (*in* Icazbalceta, Colección de documentos para la historia de México, 2 vols.), 1858-1860.
- NIEREMBERG, JOAN (*sic*) EUSEBIUS
Historia naturae, maxime peregrinae, libri XVI distincta. (Probably written shortly before 1635.)
Antverpiae, 1635.
- Noticias relativas a la conquista desde la llegada de Cortés a Tetzcucó hasta la toma del templo mayor de México* ("Fragmento 2").
Mexico (*in* Fernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc, *Crónica Mexicana*, annotated by Manuel Orozco y Berra, edited by José M. Vigil, pp. 134, 135), 1878.
- Noticias relativas al reinado de Motecuzuma Ilhuicamina* ("Fragmento 1").
Mexico (*in* Fernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc, *Crónica Mexicana*, annotated by Manuel Orozco y Berra, edited by José M. Vigil, pp. 124-134), 1878.
- OLARTE, DIEGO D'.
See under *Lettre des Chapelains Frère Toribio et Frère Diego d'Olarte*.
- ORTEGA, F.
The work cited by Bandelier is an appendix to a three-volume edition of Echeverría y Veytia, *Historia antigua de Méjico*, of which Ortega was the editor. It was published in Mexico in 1836.

✓ OVIEDO Y VALDÉS, GONZALO FERNANDEZ DE

Historia general y natural de las Indias. (Composed 1525-1550.)

Madrid, Real Academia de Historia (four folio volumes), 1851.

✓ PADILLA, AGUSTIN DÁVILA

Historia de la fundación y discurso de la provincia de Santiago de México (date of composition not ascertained).

Bruselas, 1625.

✓ PADILLA, MATÍAS DE LA MOTA

Historia de la conquista de la provincia de la Nueva-Galicia. (Written in 1742.)

Mexico (published by the Geographical and Statistical Society), 1870.

PALACIO, DIEGO GARCÍA DE

San Salvador und Honduras im Jahre 1576. (Written about 1576.)

Berlin (translated by Frantzius), 1873.

PIMENTEL NEZAHUACOTYL, HERNANDO

Memoria dirigido al rey, etc. (Date uncertain. This is an unpublished manuscript, quoted by Orozco y Berra on p. 243 of his *Geografía de las lenguas*.)

✓ POMAR, JUAN BAUTISTA

Relación de Texcoco. (Written in 1582.)

Mexico (*in* Icazbalceta, Nueva colección de documentos para la historia de México, 5 vols., 1886-1892), 1891. Subsequent to Bandelier.

Real ejecutoria de S. M. sobre tierras y reservas de Pechos y Paga perteneciente a los caciques de Axapusco de la jurisdicción de Otumba. (Issued in 1617.)

Mexico (*in* Icazbalceta, Colección de documentos para la historia de México, 2 vols., 1858-1866, vol. 2), 1866.

Relación de jornada que hizo Don Fernando de Sandoval Acaziltli, etc. (See *Acaziltli*.)

✓ *Relación de las ceremonias y ritos, población y gobierno de los Indios de la provincia de Mechuacan hecha al Ill^{mo} Dr. D. Antonio de Mendoza, Virey y Gobernador de Nueva España.* (Written between 1534 and 1551.)

Madrid (*in* Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España, 112 vols., edited by Navarrete and others, 1842-1895, vol. 53), 1842.

✓ REMESAL, ANTONIO DE

Historia de la provincia de San Vicente de Chyapa y Guatemala del orden de Santo Domingo. (Written 1613-1619.)

Madrid, 1619.

✓ SAHAGÚN, BERNARDINO DE

Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España. (Composed 1546-1569.)

London (*in* Kingsborough, Mexican Antiquities, 9 vols.), 1831.

Salmeron. (See also under *Lettre des auditeurs Salmeron, Maldonado, etc.*)

✓ SALMERON (given names not known).

... lettre ... au conseil des Indes. (Written in Mexico City, August 13, 1531.)

Paris (*in* Ternaux-Compans, Voyages, 20 vols., 1837-1841, vol. 16 [i.e., Series 2, vol. 6]), 1840.

- ✓ SOLÓRZANO Y PEREYRA, JUAN
Disputatio de Indiarum jure sive de juxta Indiarum occidentalium inquisitione, acquisitione ac retentione. (Written 1609-1629.)
Madrid, 1629.
- ✓ TAPIA, ANDRÉS DE
Relación hecha por el Señor Andrés de Tapia sobre la conquista de México.
(Date of composition not ascertained.)
Mexico (*in* Icazbalceta, Colección de documentos para la historia de México, 2 vols., 1858-1866, vol. 2), 1866.
- ✓ TEZOZOMOC, FERNANDO DE ALVARADO
Crónica Mexicana. (Composed in 1598.)
London (*in* Kingsborough, Mexican Antiquities, 9 vols., vol. 9), 1831.
Toribio de Benevente. *See* Motolinia.
Toribio et Diego d'Olarte. *See* Lettre des Toribio, etc.
- ✓ TORQUEMADA, JUAN DE
Ia (-IIIa) parte de los veinte y un libros rituales y monarquía Indiana con el origen y guerra de los Indios occidentales, de sus poblaciones, descubrimiento, conquista, conversión y otras cosas maravillosas de la misma tierra. (Composed 1589-1609.)
Madrid, 1723.
- ✓ VETANCURT, AUGUSTIN DE
Teatro Mexicano, descripción breve de los sucesos exemplares, históricos, políticos . . . del nuevo mundo occidental de las Indias. (Note.—The Crónica de la Provincia del Santa Evangelico de México, mentioned by Bandelier, is the Fourth Part of this "Teatro.") (Composition completed in 1697.)
Mexico, 1870.
- ✓ ZUAZO, ALONZO DE
Carta al Padre Fray Luis de Figueroa. (Dated Santiago de Cuba, November 14, 1521.)
Mexico (*in* Icazbalceta, Colección de documentos para la historia de México, 2 vols., 1858-1866, vol. 1), 1858.
- ✓ ZÚRITA, ALONZO DE
Breve y sumaria relación de los señores y maneras y diferencias que habla de ellas en la Nueva España y en otras provincias sus comarcas, etc. (Composed about 1560.)
Paris (*in* Ternaux-Compans, Voyages, 20 vols., 1837-1841, vol. 10), 1840. (Note.—The relation appears under the title "Rapport sur les différentes classes de chefs de Nouvelle-Espagne")

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS—(CONTINUED)

Vol. 7.	1. The Emeryville Shellmound, by Max Uhle. Pp. 1-106, plates 1-12, with 38 text figures. June, 1907	1.25
	2. Recent Investigations bearing upon the Question of the Occurrence of Neocene Man in the Auriferous Gravels of California, by William J. Sinclair. Pp. 107-130, plates 13-14. February, 190835
	3. Pomo Indian Basketry, by S. A. Barrett. Pp. 133-306, plates 15-30, 231 text figures. December, 1908	1.75
	4. Shellmounds of the San Francisco Bay Region, by N. C. Nelson. Pp. 309-356, plates 32-34. December, 190950
	5. The Ellis Landing Shellmound, by N. C. Nelson. Pp. 357-426, plates 36-50. April, 191075
	Index, pp. 427-443.	
Vol. 8.	1. A Mission Record of the California Indians, from a Manuscript in the Bancroft Library, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 1-27. May, 190825
	2. The Ethnography of the Cahuilla Indians, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 29-68, plates 1-15. July, 190875
	3. The Religion of the Luiseño and Diegueño Indians of Southern California, by Constance Goddard Dubois. Pp. 69-186, plates 16-19. June, 1908	1.25
	4. The Culture of the Luiseño Indians, by Philip Stedman Sparkman. Pp. 187-234, plate 20. August, 190850
	5. Notes on Shoshonean Dialects of Southern California, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 235-269. September, 190935
	6. The Religious Practices of the Diegueño Indians, by T. T. Waterman. Pp. 271-358, plates 21-28. March, 191080
	Index, pp. 359-369.	
Vol. 9.	1. Yana Texts, by Edward Sapir, together with Yana Myths collected by Roland B. Dixon. Pp. 1-235. February, 1910	2.50
	2. The Ohumash and Costanoan Languages, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 237-271. November, 191035
	3. The Languages of the Coast of California North of San Francisco, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 273-435, and map. April, 1911	1.50
	Index, pp. 437-439.	
Vol. 10.	1. Phonetic Constituents of the Native Languages of California, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 1-12. May, 191110
	2. The Phonetic Elements of the Northern Paiute Language, by T. T. Waterman. Pp. 13-44, plates 1-5. November, 191145
	3. Phonetic Elements of the Mohave Language, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 45-96, plates 6-20. November, 191165
	4. The Ethnology of the Salinan Indians, by J. Alden Mason. Pp. 97-240, plates 21-37. December, 1912	1.75
	5. Papago Verb Stems, by Juan Dolores. Pp. 241-263. August, 191325
	6. Notes on the Chilula Indians of Northwestern California, by Pliny Earle Goddard. Pp. 265-283, plates 38-41. April, 191430
	7. Chilula Texts, by Pliny Earle Goddard. Pp. 289-379. November, 1914	1.00
	Index, pp. 381-385.	
Vol. 11.	1. Elements of the Kato Language, by Pliny Earle Goddard. Pp. 1-176, plates 1-45. October, 1912	2.00
	2. Phonetic Elements of the Diegueño Language, by A. L. Kroeber and J. P. Harrington. Pp. 177-188. April, 191410
	3. Sarsi Texts, by Pliny Earle Goddard. Pp. 189-277. February, 1915	1.00
	4. Serian, Tequistlatecan, and Hokan, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 279-290. February, 191510
	5. Dichotomous Social Organization in South Central California, by Edward Winslow Gifford. Pp. 291-296. February, 191605
	6. The Delineation of the Day-Signs in the Aztec Manuscripts, by T. T. Waterman. Pp. 297-398. March, 1916	1.00
	7. The Mutsum Dialect of Costanoan Based on the Vocabulary of De la Cuesta, by J. Alden Mason. Pp. 399-472. March, 191670
	Index, pp. 473-479.	
Vol. 12.	1. Composition of California Shellmounds, by Edward Winslow Gifford. Pp. 1-29. February, 191630
	2. California Place Names of Indian Origin, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 31-69. June, 191640
	3. Arapaho Dialects, by A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 71-138. June, 191670
	4. Miwok Moieties, by Edward Winslow Gifford. Pp. 139-194. June, 191655
	5. On Plotting the Inflections of the Voice, by Cornelius B. Bradley. Pp. 195-218, plates 1-5. October, 191625
	6. Tübatulabal and Kawaiisu Kinship Terms, by Edward Winslow Gifford. Pp. 219-248	(In press)
	7. Bandelier's Contribution to the Study of Ancient Mexican Social Organization, by T. T. Waterman. Pp. 249-282. February, 191735

